Francia. Forschungen zur westeuropäischen Geschichte
Herausgegeben vom Deutschen Historischen Institut Paris
(Institut historique allemand)
Band 31/1 (2004)

DOI: 10.11588/fr.2004.1.63312

J. Semmler y étudie les documents liturgiques d'avant et après le changement dynastique; il remarque l'extrême rareté des documents contemporains du règne proprement dit de Pépin, mais peut affirmer que c'est durant cette période que se font le passage d'une liturgie nettement gallicane à une liturgie influencée par celle des églises de Rome ainsi que l'introduction des canons des conciles romains. Malgré l'impossibilité de conclure de façon décisive sur le rôle des évêques dans la commande des manuscrits liturgiques aux *scriptoria* monastiques (Chelles, Saint-Croix de Meaux, Corbie) il conclut néanmoins à l'existence d'une préréforme qui a permis aux évêques francs d'affronter les problèmes théologiques à partir du concile de Gentilly de 767. Dans le quatrième chapitre, J. Semmler étudie l'évolution de la conception du sacre royal au cours du IX^{e} siècle, notamment sous l'influence d'Hincmar, particulièrement importante pour le sacre de Charles le Chauve à Metz en 869. À cette occasion, l'archevêque rédige un *ordo* dont l'influence perdura jusqu'au XIX^{e} siècle. Il y décèle un changement dans la conception du sacre: celui-ci ne s'apparente plus à la confirmation, comme en 754 avec Etienne II, mais à l'onction baptismale, qui n'est pas un sacrement, mais est censée donner au roi la force de remplir sa mission. Il souligne le fait que, bien qu'Hincmar justifie sa présence à Metz par le fait que les deux provinces ecclésiastiques de Trèves et de Reims soient sœurs (Belgique première et Belgique seconde) et par le baptême de Clovis par Rémi, il n'assimile pas le baptême de Clovis à un sacre royal, ce qui sera l'œuvre des sources postérieures, la version longue du testament de saint Rémi, l'*Historia Remensis Ecclesiae* de Flodoard et les ajouts du copiste des Annales de Saint-Bertin au XI^{e} siècle. Malgré son petit format et grâce à son important appareil critique, ce livre sera donc très précieux à tous ceux qui souhaitent avoir une vision critique et documentée des événements de 751/54 et de la genèse de la cérémonie du sacre dans le royaume franc.

Michèle GAILLARD, Metz

Der Karolingische Reichskalender und seine Überlieferung bis ins 12. Jahrhundert, ed. Arno BORST (Hahnsche Buchhandlung) 2001, 3 vols., LIII–1906 p. (Monumenta Germaniae Historica. Libri Memoriales, 2).

What an impressive work! In the three massive volumes of *Der Karolingische Reichskalender*, which were published in the *Libri Memoriales* series of the prestigious *Monumenta Germaniae Historica*, Arno Borst presents to the reader a composite critical edition of Carolingian calendars. For this edition, Professor Borst has collated more than 250 manuscripts of different calendars (from the eighth to the twelfth century), which he divided into different families and sub-groups. After describing all these manuscripts in detail (p. 54–333), Borst takes us through the whole year, listing day by day the various entries he found in his database. He prints in bold those entries which he believes were part of the original *Reichskalender*, and he adds a lengthy and informative critical apparatus to each of the entries he lists. The amount of work and scholarship crammed into these three volumes is overwhelming. No wonder it took eleven years to complete this monumental edition, which is an admirable compendium of valuable information.

There is, however, one problem that might cast a shadow over this remarkable enterprise, that is, Borst's basic assumption regarding the origin and circulation of the so-called *Reichskalender*[1]. According to Borst, at the instigation of Charlemagne and his reformatory advisors a new *Reichskalender* was devised in 789 at the abbey of Lorsch. At the core of Borst's theory stands the calendar in Berlin, Staatsbibliothek, Phillipps 1869, fols. 1^{r}–11^{v} (his A1), which he believes was copied directly from the Lorsch exemplar. A colophon at the end of

1 Borst also discusses his theory in great detail in his book: Die Karolingische Kalenderreform, Hannover 1998 (MGH Schriften, 46).

this calendar (which was copied around 840 in Prüm) reads: ›Ab incarnatione Domini usque in vicessimum primum annum regni Karoli regis sunt anni DCCLXXXVIIII‹. This was enough for Borst to conclude that the original *Reichskalender* was produced in 789, which was, no doubt, a crucial year in Charlemagne's career. After all, it was at this year that the Frankish king issued his clearest statement for the reform of the Frankish Church, the so-called *Admonitio generalis*, where he also encouraged the renewal of learning, including *computus*. Hence, Borst assumes, the Lorsch calendar of 789 is a clear testimony to Charlemagne's reform programme.

However, it appears that the so-called *Reichskalender* of 789 is nothing but a figment of Borst's imagination. As Paul Meyvaert has clearly, and very persuasively, demonstrated in a recent paper, Borst's *Reichskalender* is, in fact, the calendar that Bede had attached to his *De temporum ratione*[2]. Thus, the crucial calendar in Berlin, Staatsbibliothek, Phillipps 1869 is actually an elaboration of Bede's original calendar, which was probably produced at York and brought to the court of Charlemagne by Alcuin. By 789 Bede's calendar was already in circulation for a long time, and there was no need to re-invent it at Lorsch especially for the needs of the Carolingian reforms. As Meyvaert concludes, »when striped of the accretions heaped upon it by Borst because of the late date he assigned to it, his *Reichskalender* volumes demonstrate the domination for centuries of Bede's *De temporum ratione* calendar throughout medieval Europe« (p. 44).

Moreover, Borst, it seems, still believes that uniformity was one of the key issues in Charlemagne's programme of reform. Yet, there is no evidence that Charlemagne and his advisers made any effort to attain liturgical uniformity, and if he did indeed intend to create a unified liturgy, he obviously did not succeed. The prolific liturgical productivity and creativity that characterised Merovingian Gaul, continued well into the reign of Charlemagne, and resulted in a considerable diversity of liturgical practices. As far as the *Reichskalender* is concerned, there is no evidence whatsoever that either Charlemagne or his advisers gave any order to compose such a calendar, or made any attempt to impose its use on the Frankish Church. Bearing in mind that we are well informed on the measures taken by Charlemagne and his counsellors in order to reform various aspects of the Frankish Church, the lack of any reference to *Kalenderreform* seems to be extremely significant. Thus, just as various homiliaries were copied and used, and just as many different versions of sacramentaries circulated around the Frankish kingdom, so did a plethora of liturgical calendars existed during and after Charlemagne's time. The most important aspects of these liturgical calendars is their local flavour, and this, one must admit, is completely absent from Borst's most learned, but inevitably artificial, critical edition.

Unanimitas and *concordia* were, on the other hand, part and parcel of the Carolingian rhetoric of reforms. Thus, reading Borst's comments – »Was immer Caesars Name in diesem Zusammenhang bedeuten mochte, er erinnerte jeden Gebildeten an den neuen Caesar Karl. Der königliche Löwe und die funkelnde Krone beherrschten den Himmel im ganzen, so wie die Litanei der Märtyrer die Erde im ganzen heiligte, und wie es war im Anfang, so war es jetzt und allezeit. Der Lorscher Kalender ordnete in einem oder zwei Dutzend gewöhnlicher Buchseiten nicht nur den Tageslauf eines kurzlebigen und abseitigen Königreichs zwischen Alpen und Nordsee, zwischen Erlösung und Weltende. Er wagte einen Vorgriff auf das Reich Gottes, das die zweite Bitte im Vaterunser erflehte ›wie im Himmel, so auf Erden‹« (p. 28) – makes one realise how effective Carolingian propaganda still is.

Yitzhak Hen, Beer-Sheva

2 Paul Meyvaert, Discovering the calendar *(Annalis libellus)* attached to Bede's own copy of *De temporum ratione*, in: Analecta Bollandiana 120 (2002) p. 5–64.